



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,789	03/29/2001	Noboru Goto	9319S-000196	5502
27572	7590	03/05/2004	EXAMINER	
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			NGUYEN, TU T	
P.O. BOX 828			ART UNIT	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			PAPER NUMBER	

2877

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,789

Applicant(s)

GOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Tu T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address.--

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 6, 7 and 9-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Species I (Claims 1,3-5 and 8) filed on 12/01/2003 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the species are so related to each other that an undue burden would not be placed upon the Examiner by maintaining both species in a single application. This is not found persuasive because each species uses different type of detector and using different method for examining foreign matters (see the restriction requirement from the last Office Action).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Drawings

Figures 14-15 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

For this application, the abstract is more than 150 words.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- 1) Specification, paragraph [0015], change "Fig. 4" to – Figs. 4(1), 4(2) --.
- 2) Specification, paragraph [0016], change "Fig. 5" to – Figs. 5(1), 5(2) --.
- 3) Specification, paragraph [0019], change "Fig. 8" to – Figs. 8(1), 8(2) --.
- 4) Specification, paragraph [0024], change "Fig. 13" to – Figs. 13(1), 13(2) --.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-5,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (figs 14-15) (AAPA hereinafter) in view of Kazuo (JP # 61-256237) and further view of Aloni et al (6,360,005).

With respect to claims 1,8, AAPA discloses a method for examining foreign matters in through holes, the method characterized in that light 2 (fig 14) passing through a plurality of through holes having a uniform size (fig 15) is taken as image data by a sensor camera 4 (fig 14).

AAPA does not disclose taking the image data by relative translation movement of a line sensor. Kazuo discloses a method for inspecting an area by taking image data relatively translation movement of the pattern (abstract) and Aloni discloses a method for inspecting foreign particles by comparing the measured area to an adjacent area (column 1, lines 35-41). It would have been obvious to modify AAPA with the method of taking image data as taught by Kazuo and comparing method as taught by Aloni to test for the unrepeatable faults as taught by Aloni in column 1, lines 34-42. Further, Kazuo does not disclose the translation movement of the line sensor. However, Kazuo's translation movement of the pattern relative to the sensor camera (fig 1) would create the same image data as the claimed invention.

With respect to claims 3-4, it would have been obvious to modify AAPA by counting or determining a number of areas of light receiving regions corresponding to the through hole or labeling the areas of light receiving region to facilitate the testing.

Art Unit: 2877

With respect to claim 5, Kazuo discloses detecting the changes in the video signal (magnitude of the video signal) for determining the defects.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2424. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F 7:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tu T. Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2877

02/20/2004